

**From:** CFG1922@aol.com  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 7:47 PM  
**Subject:** Broadcast ownership rules

The Honorable Michael J. Copps, Commissioner. I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air. The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and for our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

**From:** CFG1922@aol.com  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 7:47 PM  
**Subject:** Broadcast ownership rules

The Honorable Kathleen Q. Abernathy, Commissioner. I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air. The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and for our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

**From:** Ppuntonioj@aol.com  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 7:51 PM  
**Subject:** Upcoming FCC vote on media deregulation

Dear Commissioner- It is imperative that we put a stop to further consolidation of the media in the name of "deregulation." The media companies have failed in their public trust to provide fair, unbiased information about the most important issues, most notably the recent coverage of the war in Iraq. As an American concerned about our democracy, I urge you to challenge the media conglomerates to open the broadcast spectrum to a diverse range of journalists and opinions, and to reinstate the Fairness Doctrine. Oppose media deregulation. Thank you, Jenny Pschaida.

**From:** Chelacheelo@aol.com  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 8:07 PM  
**Subject:** upcoming FCC deadline (6-2-03)

Dear Mrs. Abernathy,  
I am requesting that the FCC postpone this upcoming deadline and offer more public hearings. The airwaves belong to the people. The people have a right to know and a right to share their support or concern for what might be a major change in the way the public receives information thru the mass media. The FCC should make every attempt to explain its position and let the public share its concerns and ideas. Thank you for your time. Michele Benderra, a concerned American.

**From:** Dave Berardinelli  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 8:20 PM  
**Subject:** Broadcast Ownership Rules

Dear Mr. Copps,

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now *lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules* already have a known track records in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely,  
Mr. David P. Berardinelli  
Chelmsford, Massachusetts

**From:** Billy/Horrdo1  
**To:** Billy/Horrdo1, Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 8:27 PM  
**Subject:** Re: revision of limits

on 5/4/03 5:27 PM, Billy/Horrdo1 at horrido1@pacbell.net wrote:

- > Dear Sir,
- >
- > I am writing to ask you or your dept. to give me the information on how to
- > make my opinion count as an American citizen concerning the "potential
- > revision of the ownership limits approaches". With a June 2nd deadline we must
- > react fast to this assault to suppress our access to anything but government
- > controlled media. Please e-mail me at:
- >
- > horrido1@pacbell.net
- >
- > Please include all names/titles, e-mail addresses, and phone numbers of the
- > people that are responsible for making the decision on this matter.
- >
- > Thank You and I look forward for a very fast response please, Billy

**From:** Julia  
**To:** john\_mccain@mccain.senate.gov, Mike Powell, KM KJMWEB, Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 8:31 PM  
**Subject:** Upcoming FCC vote on media deregulation

Dear Senator J. McCain, Chairman Powell, and Commissioners,

Further consolidation of the media in the name of "deregulation" must be halted. The media companies have failed in their public trust to provide unbiased information about most crucial issues, most notably the recent coverage of the war in Iraq.

As an American concerned about our democracy, I call on you to challenge the media conglomerates, to open the *broadcast spectrum* to a diverse range of journalists and opinions, and to reinstate the Fairness Doctrine. Oppose media deregulation.

Julia B. Cochrane  
PO Box 1654  
Port Townsend, WA 98368

**From:** Rich12332@cs.com  
**To:** Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 8:39 PM  
**Subject:** FCC Rule change

> Dear Media Corps member,  
>  
> This week's MoveOn Bulletin focuses on a rule change at the FCC that  
> could change the media landscape in drastic ways. Next week, we'll  
> begin an extensive campaign to fight media consolidation and make the  
> FCC do its duty. The bulletin below provides some good background for  
> that fight. I hope you enjoy it.

>  
> --Eli

> \_\_\_\_\_  
>  
> SHOWDOWN AT THE FCC  
> MoveOn Bulletin  
> Friday, May 2, 2003  
> Co-Editors: Don Hazen and Lakshmi Chaudry, AlterNet

>  
> Subscribe online at:  
> <http://www.moveon.org/moveonbulletin/>  
>  
> You can unsubscribe at any time by clicking here:  
> <http://moveon.org/s?i=1336-648955-ZTGvhcf9CkBhv6OIctvkRw>

>  
> CONTENTS:  
> 1. Eli Pariser: Why Worry About Who Owns the Media?  
> 2. Jeff Chester: Showdown at the FCC  
> 3. Neil Hickey: The Gathering Storm Over Media Ownership  
> 4. Bill Moyers: Barry Diller Takes On Media Deregulation  
> 5. Danny Schechter: The Media, the War, and Our Right to Know  
> 6. Eric Boehlert: Clear Channel's Big Stinking Deregulation Mess  
> 7. Paul Schmelzer: The Death of Local News  
> 8. Caryl Rivers: Where Have All the Women Gone?  
> 9. About the Bulletin

>  
> \_\_\_\_\_  
>  
> WHY WORRY ABOUT WHO OWNS THE MEDIA?  
> MoveOn Bulletin Op-Ed  
> by Eli Pariser

>  
> It's like something out of a nightmare, but it really happened: At  
> 1:30 on a cold January night, a train containing hundreds of thousands  
> of gallons of toxic ammonia derails in Minot, North Dakota. Town  
> officials try to sound the emergency alert system, but it isn't  
> working. Desperate to warn townspeople about the poisonous white cloud  
> bearing down on them, the officials call their local radio stations.  
> But no one answers any of the phones for an hour and a half.  
> According to the New York Times, three hundred people are  
> hospitalized, some are partially blinded, and pets and livestock are  
> killed.

>



- > Where were Minot's DJs on January 18th, 2002? Where was the late
- > night station crew? As it turns out, six of the seven local radio
- > stations had recently been purchased by Clear Channel Communications,
- > a radio giant with over 1,200 stations nationwide. Economies of scale
- > dictated that most of the local staff be cut: Minot stations ran more
- > or less on auto pilot, the programming largely dictated from further
- > up the Clear Channel food chain. No one answered the phone because
- > hardly anyone worked at the stations any more; the songs played in
- > Minot were the same as those played on Clear Channel stations across
- > the Midwest.
- >
- > Companies like Clear Channel argue that economies of scale allow them
- > to cut costs while continuing to provide quality programming. But
- > they do so at the expense of local coverage. It's not just about
- > emergency warnings: media mergers are decreasing coverage of local
- > political races, local small businesses, and local events. There are
- > only a third as many owners of newspapers and TV stations as there
- > were in the 1970s (about 600 now; over 1,500 then). It's harder and
- > harder for Americans to find out what's going on in their own back
- > yards.
- >
- > On June 2, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is considering
- > relaxing or getting rid of rules to allow much more media
- > concentration. While the actual rule changes are under wraps, they
- > could allow enormous changes in the American media environment. For
- > example, one company could be allowed to own ABC, CBS, and NBC.
- > Almost certainly, media companies will be allowed to own newspapers
- > and TV stations in the same town. We could be entering a new era of
- > media megaliths.
- >
- > Do you want one or two big companies acting as gatekeepers and
- > controlling your access to news and entertainment? Most of us don't.
- > And the airwaves explicitly belong to us -- the American people. We
- > allow media companies to use them in exchange for their assurance that
- > they're serving the public interest, and it's the FCC's job to make
- > sure that's so. For the future of American journalism, and for the
- > preservation of a diverse and local media, we have to hold the FCC to
- > its mission. Otherwise, Minot's nightmare may become our national
- > reality.
- >
- > -----
- >
- > Interested in taking on the FCC and other media-related concerns?
- > Join the MoveOn Media Corps, a group of over 29,000 committed
- > Americans working for a fair and balanced media. You can sign up
- > now at:
- > <http://www.moveon.org/mediacorps/>
- >
- > -----
- >
- > SHOWDOWN AT THE FCC
- > Jeffrey Chester and Don Hazen, AlterNet
- > Despite wide protests and the Clear Channel debacle, the FCC is about
- > to award the nation's biggest media conglomerates a new give-away that
- > will further concentrate media ownership in fewer hands. The impact on
- > the American media landscape could be disastrous. Recent TV coverage

> of the Iraq war already illustrates that US media companies aren't  
> interested in providing a serious range of analysis and debate. This  
> overview describes what's at stake and offers an introduction to the  
> following articles.

> <http://www.alternet.org/story.html?StoryID=15796>

>

> -----

>

#### > THE GATHERING STORM OVER MEDIA OWNERSHIP

> Neil Hickey, Columbia Journalism Review

> CJR's editor-at-large explains just what is at stake in this fight  
> over media ownership. He provides an in-depth look at the issues, and  
> major players in a battle that is pitting journalists against their  
> bosses, breaking up old alliances, and gathering momentum as the day  
> of reckoning draws near. He traces the snowballing trend of media  
> consolidation and its implications for the future, revealing just how  
> the drive for profit is eroding diversity, local control, and more  
> importantly giving a few mega-corporations a monopoly over the  
> dissemination of news.

> <http://www.alternet.org/story.html?StoryID=15654>

>

> -----

>

#### > BARRY DILLER TAKES ON MEDIA DEREGULATION

> Bill Moyers, Now with Bill Moyers

> The founder of Fox Broadcasting and present CEO of USA Networks is an  
> unlikely but passionate opponent of plans to loosen media ownership  
> rules. In an interview with Bill Moyers, the media mogul explains how  
> deregulation creates corporations with "such overwhelming power in the  
> marketplace that everyone has to do essentially what they say."  
> Diller argues that government regulation is essential to prevent media  
> companies from controlling everything we see, read, and hear. As he  
> puts it, "Who else is gonna do it for us?"

> <http://www.alternet.org/story.html?StoryID=15768>

>

> -----

>

#### > THE MEDIA, THE WAR, AND OUR RIGHT TO KNOW

> Danny Schechter, MediaChannel.org

> Why did the media do such a poor job of reporting on the Iraq war? The  
> boosterism of news anchors, the suppression of antiwar views, and the  
> sanitized images of war that defined television coverage are not a  
> simple matter of bias or ineptitude, says media analyst Danny  
> Schechter. He draws attention to the connection between the decisions  
> made by journalists and the lobbying efforts of owners who will  
> profit immensely from the upcoming FCC decision in June.

> <http://www.mediachannel.org/views/dissector/moveon.shtml>

>

> -----

>

#### > CLEAR CHANNEL'S BIG STINKING DEREGULATION MESS

> Eric Boehlert, Salon

> Clear Channel, the radio and concert conglomerate, has been the  
> greatest beneficiary of the 1996 Telecommunications Act, which  
> stripped all ownership limits in the radio industry. The rapacious  
> company, led by Bush supporter Lowly Mays, has grown from 40 stations

- > to 1,225 since then, and now uses its power to routinely bully
- > advertisers and record companies, and more recently censor antiwar
- > artists. However, as Eric Boehlert points out, its "success" may be
- > the most powerful weapon in the arsenal of media activists. Clear
- > Channel's stranglehold on the radio industry is the best and clearest
- > example of the effects of rampant deregulation.
- > <http://www.alternet.org/story.html?StoryID=15281>
- >
- > -----
- >
- > **THE DEATH OF LOCAL NEWS**
- > Paul Schmelzer, AlterNet
- > Meet the Sinclair Broadcast Group, the "Clear Channel of local news."
- > Since 1991, the company has managed to acquire 62 television stations
- > or 24 percent of the national TV audience. The company's modus
- > operandi is the centralized production of homogenized, repackaged faux
- > "local" news. Its success offers an alarming glimpse of the
- > post-deregulation world in which all news may be produced in one giant
- > newsroom and from a single viewpoint -- which in Sinclair's case is
- > wholeheartedly conservative.
- > <http://www.alternet.org/story.html?StoryID=15718>.
- >
- > -----
- >
- > **WHERE HAVE ALL THE WOMEN GONE?**
- > Caryl Rivers, Women's Enews
- > Once the war on Iraq took center-stage in the headlines of newspapers
- > and magazines across the country, women writers became increasingly
- > rare in the media. In their place are mostly white men who write on a
- > narrow band of foreign policy issues, mostly recycling their views
- > over and over again. From the all-male line-ups in the op-ed pages of
- > the Washington Post and the New York Times to the dwindling female
- > bylines in the New Yorker and Atlantic Monthly, women's voices have
- > been caught in a "spiral of silence" that is unprecedented since the
- > pre-women's movement days.
- > <http://www.alternet.org/story.html?StoryID=15677>
- >
- > -----
- >
- > **ABOUT THE MOVEON BULLETIN AND MOVEON.ORG**
- > The MoveOn Bulletin is a free email bulletin providing information,
- > resources, news, and action ideas on important political issues. The
- > full text of the MoveOn Bulletin is online at
- > <http://www.moveon.org/moveonbulletin/>; you can subscribe to it at that
- > address. The MoveOn Bulletin is a project of MoveOn.org.
- >
- > MoveOn.org is an issue-oriented, nonpartisan, nonprofit organization
- > that gives people a voice in shaping the laws that affect their lives.
- > MoveOn.org engages people in the civic process, using the Internet to
- > democratically determine a non-partisan agenda, raising public
- > awareness of pressing issues, and coordinating grassroots advocacy
- > campaigns to encourage sound public policies. You can help decide the
- > direction of MoveOn.org by participating in the discussion forum at:
- > [http://www.actionforum.com/forum/index.html?forum\\_id=223](http://www.actionforum.com/forum/index.html?forum_id=223)
- >

**From:** Elaine Pawlak  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 8:46 PM  
**Subject:** *Freedom of Speech*

Hearing diverse views is essential in maintaining a democracy. The public airways should not be owned and operated by just a few who would control access to critical information and public opinion.

Please advise what concerned citizens can do to assure that ownership is not *in the hands of just a few*.

Elaine Pawlak

**CC:** Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

**From:** CarlS  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein, Kathleen Abernathy, KM KJMWEB, Mike Powell  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 8:57 PM  
**Subject:** Broadcast Ownership Rulemakings

May 4, 2003

The Honorable Michael K. Powell, Chairman, FCC  
The Honorable Kathleen Q. Abernathy, Commissioner, FCC  
The Honorable Jonathan S. Adelstein, Commissioner, FCC  
The Honorable Michael J. Copps, Commissioner, FCC  
The Honorable Kevin J. Martin, Commissioner, FCC

Comments re Broadcast Ownership Rulemakings on Dual Network, Radio  
Market Definition, Experimental Station and Newspaper/Broadcast  
Cross-Ownership

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect  
American Citizens from media monopolies.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media  
conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news  
and information in communities across our nation. Many of the  
corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership  
rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing  
viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on  
important issues. They have the right to hear everyone, and that  
right should not be abrogated by government. Therefore, for the sake  
of our Constitutional Republic and our freedom, I urge you to continue  
the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to  
ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely,

William Shires  
US Army (Ret.)  
1136 Johnnie Bud Lane  
Cookeville, Tennessee 38501

**From:** VICKI CORLEY  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 9:09 PM  
**Subject:** Media-ownership rules

Dear Mr. Copps:

I am opposed to relaxing media-ownership rules for the FCC.

I am disturbed by the lack of coverage by our media and newspapers of important events like the Democratic contenders debate held last night at the University of South Carolina.

If even the Democrats cannot make themselves heard, what hope is there for smaller groups who have First Amendment rights to free speech and to having their speech and ideas published and seen?

I urge you, as a member of a "free" society, and as a member of the FCC, to make our media more open to differing ideas and opinions by making media-ownership rules more stringent, thus preventing big trusts from controlling free speech.

Yours sincerely,

Vicki Corley

**From:** diana-k@juno.com  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 9:15 PM  
**Subject:** Media Concentration: reply to public comments

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review - Review  
of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules  
Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996,  
Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, MM Docket No. 02-277,  
(rel. Sept. 23, 2002)

To:  
FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell  
FCC Commissioners Kathleen Q. Abernathy, Michael J. Copps, Kevin J.  
Martin, and Jonathan S. Adelstein

I am writing to you today to reply to the public comments on Docket No.  
02-277, The Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules.  
To promote competition, diversity and local content, the FCC should  
RETAIN THE CURRENT MEDIA OWNERSHIP RULES and impose stricter public  
interest requirements.

The studies commissioned by the FCC are flawed and incomplete. By  
allowing our media outlets to merge print and broadcast facilities a  
greater restriction on the breadth of news and information available to  
citizens to act in the public interest will result.

The public interest will best be served by preserving media ownership  
rules in question in this proceeding.

In addition, I strongly encourage the Commission to hold hearings in all  
parts of the country and solicit the widest possible participation from  
the public which will be the most directly affected by the outcomes of  
these decisions.

Thank you,

Diana Schmielt  
305 Ramona Drive  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93405

**From:** diana-k@juno.com  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 9:15 PM  
**Subject:** Media Concentration: reply to public comments

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review - Review  
of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules  
Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996,  
Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, MM Docket No. 02-277,  
(rel. Sept. 23, 2002)

To:  
FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell  
FCC Commissioners Kathleen Q. Abernathy, Michael J. Copps, Kevin J.  
Martin, and Jonathan S. Adelstein

I am writing to you today to reply to the public comments on Docket No.  
02-277, The Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules.  
To promote competition, diversity and local content, the FCC should  
RETAIN THE CURRENT MEDIA OWNERSHIP RULES and impose stricter public  
interest requirements.

The studies commissioned by the FCC are flawed and incomplete. By  
allowing our media outlets to merge print and broadcast facilities a  
greater restriction on the breadth of news and information available to  
citizens to act in the public interest will result.

The public interest will best be served by preserving media ownership  
rules in question in this proceeding.

In addition, I strongly encourage the Commission to hold hearings in all  
parts of the country and solicit the widest possible participation from  
the public which will be the most directly affected by the outcomes of  
these decisions.

Thank you,

Diana Schmielt  
305 Ramona Drive  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93405



**From:** james.b.hoar@us.abb.com  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 9:20 PM  
**Subject:** media deregulation

Commissioner Copps, please help us defeat media deregulation.  
We do not want the big media companies ruling the airways.  
What can we do to help?

James and Louise Hoar  
7 Strawberry Fields  
Granby, CT 06035  
(860) 653-3393  
james.b.hoar@us.abb.com

**From:** VICKI CORLEY  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 9:50 PM  
**Subject:** FCC media-ownership rules

Dear Ms.Abernathy:

I am opposed to relaxing media-ownership rules for the FCC.

I am disturbed by the lack of coverage by our media and newspapers of important events like the Democratic contenders debate held last night at the University of South Carolina.

If even the Democrats cannot make themselves heard, what hope is there for smaller groups who have First Amendment rights to free speech and to having their speech and ideas published and seen?

I urge you, as a member of a "free" society, and as a member of the FCC, to make our media more open to differing ideas and opinions by making media-ownership rules more stringent, thus preventing big trusts from controlling free speech.

Yours sincerely,  
Vicki Corley

**From:** Cynthia Ross  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 9:56 PM  
**Subject:** Deregulation--already too much

Dear FCC officials,

I am writing to go on record as being against any further deregulation of the media/airwaves by the FCC--in fact I would prefer to see this group "put things back the way they were." I do not think the regulations are/were out-of-date and in need of change--any more than the Constitution is out-of-date.

The regulations are/were fine for today's world, just as when first written. Deregulation/change is placing the control of the newspapers, TV, and radio in the hands of a very few people and therefore is stifling opinion and diversity. Previous deregulation has already had an adverse effect. American "journalists" are becoming the laughing stock of the world because they are managed by the few media owners and the government. Much of what is broadcast follows the line of FOX news and their many newspapers. In American, if you want to know what is really happening (impartial journalism) you need to go to the media in another country. That is sad! Please don't make it even worse!

Thank you for your time.  
Cindy Ross

---

Do you Yahoo!?  
The New Yahoo! Search - Faster. Easier. Bingo.  
<http://search.yahoo.com>

**From:** Lulu Hughes  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 10:03 PM  
**Subject:** Media Ownership

Dear Commission Copps,

Thank you for appearing on Bill Moyers' show, NOW. We wish to register our support for your position concerning the media ownership issue scheduled to come before the FCC. We appreciate your efforts in sounding the alarm. As a retired journalist it is my opinion we need re-regulation and not a total abandonment of the airwaves to further conglomeration.

Richard B. and Mary Lou Hughes, Wilson Wyoming

**From:** unity@linkamerica.net  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Sun, May 4, 2003 10:06 PM  
**Subject:** Protect Children's Television!

FCC Commissioner Michael J. Copps

Dear FCC Commissioner Michael J. Copps,

The FCC must consider the unique needs of children in its upcoming rulemaking on *broadcast ownership rules*.

Children consume almost five and a half hours of media per day. Research has shown that media, particularly television, play a unique and powerful role in children's development.

The FCC should consider how further relaxation of media ownership rules would impact children's programming. Deregulation may reduce competition, increase commercialism and result in less original programming for children.

Before making any regulatory changes to existing media ownership rules, the FCC must consider how children will be affected.

Sincerely,

Kim Newsome  
Box 912  
Dahlonega, Georgia 30533-0016

cc:  
Senator Saxby Chambliss  
Representative Charlie Norwood  
Senator Zell Miller